

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action mailed December 18, 2006, claims 1-15, 27, 28, 30 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101; claims 1-3, 5, 7-11, 13, 15-19, 21, 23-25, 27, 28, 30 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Muuss (Combinatorial Solid Geometry, Boundary Representations, and Non-Manifold Geometry"); and claims 4, 6, 12, 14, 20 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable in view of Muuss and Tsap ("Efficient Nonlinear Finite Element Modeling of Nonrigid Objects via Optimization of Mesh Models").

On page 2, the Office Action stated the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection had been maintained because "generating integrated data is not a tangible result" at item 2, sub-item i. By this amendment, it is submitted that independent claims 1, 17, and 31 produce tangible results. Specifically, claim 1 recites "a generating unit generating analytical data ... to the analysis apparatus" at lines 8-10 and it is submitted that generating data to an analysis apparatus is a tangible result. Claim 17 recites "generating analytical data ... and storing said analytical data" at lines 8-10 and it is submitted that storing analytical data is a tangible result. Claim 31 recites "integrating the type and parameters into a header for geometric data that includes mesh data and used in the analysis by the analytical program" at lines 4-5 and it is submitted that integrating data for use by an analytical program is a tangible result.

In view of the above, it is submitted that independent claims 1, dependent claims 2-8, which depend therefrom, produce tangible results and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Dependent claims 27, 28, and 30 depend on claim 17 and for the reasons submitted above, it is submitted that these claims produce a tangible result and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Furthermore, by this amendment, claims 9-16 have been cancelled and withdrawal of rejection of these claims is respectfully requested.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5, 7-11, 13, 15-19, 21, 23-25, 27, 28, 30 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Claim 1 recites "[a]n analysis support apparatus for supporting an apparatus performing an analysis using geometric data to check characteristics of a structure representing by the geometric data" (emphasis added) at lines 1-3. Thus, claim 1 is to a support apparatus directed to checking characteristics of data and is not directed to simply "performing an analysis of geometric data" as alleged in sub-item ii on page 2 of the Office Action.

In contrast, Muuss discussed the processing of the data of an object using various characteristic data for the object and geometric data used in the analysis. That is, Muuss is

about performing an analysis and does not provide details regarding how to support the analysis described.

Specifically, nothing has been cited or found in Muuss that disclose a “generating unit generating analytical data formed by at least the obtained analytical conditions and the geometric data corresponding to the specified types of analyses as integrated data to the analysis apparatus” as recited in lines 8-10. The Office Action cited figures 1 and 2 and pages 2-3 and 6-7 in rejecting claim 1, but did not provide a specific citation to where in Muuss the above-recited element of claim 1 was disclosed. After reviewing the portions cited by the Office Action, it is clear that Muuss offers no description of how to form integrated data of any sort, let alone that which has been recited in claim 1. For example, figure 1 is described by Muuss as the “design loop” on page 4, last sentence of the first paragraph. Additionally, Muuss stated on page 7 “[t]his applications interface is depicted in Figure 2” at line 8. It is submitted that the design loop of figure 1 and applications interface of figure 2 do not anticipate lines 8-10 recited in claim 1. With regard to pages 2-3 and 6-7 of Muuss, all that has been found is a description of how a typical CAD system operates and does not disclose “generating analytical data formed by at least the obtained analytical conditions and the geometric data”.

Claim 17 recites “generating analytical data formed by at least the obtained analytical conditions and the geometric data corresponding to the specified types of analyses as integrated data and storing said analytical data” at lines 8-10. It is submitted, for the reasons submitted above, that independent claim 17 and dependent claims 18, 19, 21, 23-25, 27, 28, and 30, which depend therefrom and add additional patentable distinctions, are patentably distinguishable from Muuss.

Claim 31 recites “integrating the type and parameters into a header for geometric data used in the analysis by the analytical program” at lines 4-5. The Office Action cited figure 2 and page 64 of Muuss as allegedly anticipating this element of claim 31. As stated above, however, Muuss described figure 7 as an applications interface on page 7. Thus, it is submitted that the applications interface of figure 2 does not anticipate lines 4-5 recited in claim 31. Furthermore, page 64 of Muuss identifies parameters for thermal analysis, but does not discuss how such parameters are stored or transferred. Thus, it is submitted that page 64 does not anticipate lines 4-5 of claim 31. Therefore, it is submitted that independent claim 31 is patentably distinguishable from Muuss.

On page 7 of the Office Action, claims 4, 6 12, 14, 20 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Muuss and Tsap. In addition to what was cited above in Muuss, the

Office Action also made reference to section 3.6 of Tsap. After reviewing Tsap, and particularly section 3.6, it is clear that Tsap disclosed *uses* of mesh sizes in analysis, but not discuss data structure. Therefore, it is submitted that Muuss and Tsap, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest what has been claimed in claims 4, 6, 20 and 22.

New claim 32 recites "integrating the type and parameters with geometric data to form integrated data and outputting to a storage unit" in the last two lines. It is submitted, for the reasons discussed above, that claim 32 is patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art of record.

Additionally, by this amendment, claims 9-16 have been cancelled. Withdrawal of all rejections based on cited prior art is respectfully requested.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

04/18/07

By:



David E. Moore

Registration No. 59,047

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501